

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-2068**

---

HENK VISSER,

versus

Plaintiff - Appellant,

DIANA ANDRUSH; ELISABETH DOLE; TERRY DORNBUSH;  
LOUIS J. FREEH; W. BURNELL HURT; MADELEINE K.  
ALBRIGHT; WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST; JANET RENO;  
BILL CLINTON; KENNETH W. STARR; BERT DE VRIES;  
AD MELKERT; R. S. CROLL; GIJS DE VRIES; FRANK  
DE GRAVE; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; THE NETH-  
ERLANDS, jointly, its King, Consuls, Officers,  
Executives, Ambassadors, Public Ministers and  
those a party as "Unknown Foreign Subjects";  
J. VAN'T HOF; VAN RHIJN,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Joseph H. Young, Senior District Judge.  
(CA-99-547-Y)

---

Submitted: September 28, 1999

Decided: October 27, 1999

---

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

---

Henk Visser, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Henk Visser appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999) complaint. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because Appellant's notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded thirty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to note an appeal, see Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). This appeal period is "mandatory and jurisdictional." Browder v. Director, Dep't of Corrections, 434 U.S. 257, 264 (1978) (quoting United States v. Robinson, 361 U.S. 220, 229 (1960)).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on March 9, 1999.\* Appellant's notice of appeal was filed on August 2, 1999. Because Appellant failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. Accordingly, we deny Appellant's motions for discovery, sanctions, and "Motion Pending Scheduling the Appeal" as

---

\* Although the district court's order is dated March 5, 1999 and marked "filed" on March 8, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket on March 9, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the effective date of the district court's decision is the date that the order was entered on the docket. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234 (4th Cir. 1986).

moot. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED